

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are presently pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker. Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, “providing a first parameter to a first register indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines”. Examiner has indicated that Baker teaches, “providing a first parameter (fig. 3, col. 13, ln. 64-67 cont’ col. 14, ln 1-18 “modulated chrominance components”) to a first register (fig. 3 item 136, also, col. 13, ln 64-67 cont’ col. 14, ln. 1-18 “video output memory”) indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines (Col. 13, ln 64-67 cont’ col. 14, ln 1-18, where Baker’s “modulated chrominance components” contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream, indicating a first number of image lines)”.

Assignee respectfully traverses. The “modulated chrominance components”, in Baker are not “indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines”. Baker notes that, “Video and broadcast formats, on the other hand, typically have luminance components representing intensity and modulated chrominance components providing color information.” Baker, Col. 1, Lines 62-64. “[I]ndicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines” is entirely different from merely “providing color information”. Moreover, the mere fact that the “modulated chrominance components” “contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream”, by no means indicates “a first number of image lines”. Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 4, and 9, as well as to the dependent claims.

Additionally, claim 1 recites, among other limitations, “providing a second parameter to a second register indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines”. Examiner has indicated that Baker “providing a second parameter to a second register indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines”. Examiner has indicated that Baker teaches, “providing a second parameter (fig. 3, col. 13, ln. 64-67 cont’ col. 14, ln 1-18 “luminance components”) to a second register (fig. 3 item 128, also, col. 13, ln 64-67 cont’ col. 14, ln. 1-18 “display memory”) indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines (Col. 13, ln 64-67 cont’ col. 14, ln 1-18, where Baker’s

“luminance components” contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream, indicating a first number of image lines”.

Assignee respectfully traverses. The “luminance components”, in Baker are not “indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines”. Baker notes that, “Video and broadcast formats, on the other hand, typically have luminance components representing intensity and modulated chrominance components providing color information.” Baker, Col. 1, Lines 62-64. “[I]ndicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines” is entirely different from merely “representing intensity”. Moreover, the mere fact that the “luminance components” “contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream”, by no means indicates “a second number of image lines”.

However, even if contributing to the “run-length encoded (RLE) image stream” were to indicate “number of image lines”, contributing to the “run-length encoded (RLE) image stream” could not both “indicat[e] that the picture comprises a first number of lines” and “indicat[e] that the picture comprises a second number lines”.

Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 4, and 9, as well as to the dependent claims.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for statutory double patenting. Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection and notes that claim 2 recites, “providing a last of the first number of lines for scaling or composing or capturing”. Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2, and further adds the limitation, “fetching a last of the first number of lines for scaling or composing or capturing”. Clearly, these limitations do not cover the same thing. Accordingly for these reasons, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, and 14.

In addition to the reasons indicated with respect to claim 1, Assignee traverses the rejections to claim 4, because Baker does not teach or fairly suggest “a controller for providing a first parameter to the feeder indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines and providing a second parameter to the scalar or compositor or capture indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines”. Examiner reads “feeder” on fig. 3, item 314 and “scalar” on fig. 3, item 306. Even if “feeder” were properly read on fig. 3, item 314, and “scalar” were properly read on fig. 3, item 306, and “providing a first parameter to a first register indicating that the picture comprises a first number of

lines; and providing a second parameter to a second register indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines" were properly read on Col. 13, lines 64-67 through Col. 14, Lines 1-18, there is no teaching of "providing a first parameter to the feeder indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines and providing a second parameter to the scalar or compositor or capture indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines". Accordingly, for this reason alone, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 4.

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 44,052

October 29, 2007

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison – Suite 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000  
FAX (312) 775-8100